	Case 1:05-cv-00003-AWI-SKO	Document 49	Filed 08/20/08	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE				
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	DARREN HARRIS,	1:05-	cv-00003-OWW-	WMW (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,	ORD	FR DENYING M	OTION FOR	
13	vs.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL			
14	DR. KLARICH, et al.,	(DOC	(DOCUMENT #47)		
15	Defendants.	(
16	/				
17	On August 18, 2008, plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel.				
	Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, <u>Rand v.</u>				
	Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the court cannot require an attorney to				
	represent plaintiff pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court				
	for the Southern District of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). However, in				
	certain exceptional circumstances the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel				
	pursuant to section 1915(e)(1). Rand, 113 F.3d at 1525.				
24	Without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the court				
	will seek volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining				
	whether "exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of				
	success of the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims <i>pro se</i> in light of				
28	the complexity of the legal issues involved	d.'' <u>ld</u> . (internal q	uotation marks ar	nd citations omitted).	

Case 1:05-cv-00003-AWI-SKO Document 49 Filed 08/20/08 Page 2 of 2

1	In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances.				
2	Even if it is assumed that plaintiff is not well versed in the law and that he has made serious				
3	allegations which, if proved, would entitle him to relief, his case is not exceptional. This court is				
4	faced with similar cases almost daily. Further, at this early stage in the proceedings, the court				
5	cannot make a determination that plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits, and based on a				
6	review of the record in this case, the court does not find that plaintiff cannot adequately articulate				
7	his claims. <u>Id</u> .				
8	For the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is				
9	HEREBY DENIED, without prejudice.				
10					
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
12	Dated: August 20, 2008 /s/ William M. Wunderlich UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE				
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					